Dear Paul,

3/23/78

Glad to get your Epsteinker notes of 3/15. Hope that what is to follow will include specifics of factual error. I believe that except in one area doctrinal criticism will get us nowhere. This is the area of Steve Bell's question about not inquiring into the possibility of LHO's CIA association.

I spotted some errors in the magazine writings. Sylvia has done a short memo on some. I presume there will be others. And that it would be good for all of us to be prepared to make responses, whether or not we take initiatives to that end.

Glad you are doing a crifical piece and included the reservation in the memo. I'll give Jim and Howard copies.

It is wher you mention the Readers Dugest money in this memo that I think you get to what can be significant, perhaps more than usual in this instance. I'd hoped that first Jerry and then Sylvia might explore this but that seems not to be likely. If you can, by direct questions to Readers Digest and Epsteinker, great. Refusals will also help. I think they can't answer. Meanwhile, I've taken the FOIA road with both CIA and FBI on this, in addition to my earlier requests that are without response. I now believe I will get some response from FBI but will have to sue CIA, as I've mentioned to JL.

I also have asked for the LHO interceptions, as Mark Allen did. But my request is for all, anywhere, not just of mail.

Jim now thinks that we'll be able to depose some of these characters in a lawsuit in which their word is at issue. So all specifics, particularly relating to Briggs and FOIA, can be useful.

He got a discovery order from a judge yesterday. The case is C.A.77-1997. Not JFK but Briggs did the withholding.

When Sylvia did not respond to my suggestion that she do it I made a pro forma Fairness Doctrine request of ABC. My hunch is that they'll ignore it. My disposition now is also to ignore it until the indications are that it should not be ignored. However, the situation can change abruptly. So for this possibility plus the possibilities in depositions I think it might be useful, when you have drafted your article, if you could let us have a copy. You may have something in it that we are not aware of because I did not know it of did forget it or did not think of it.

The book I was to have received has not come and there is none locally. I've asked JL to get one and mail it to me so I'll be reading it when and as I can after getting it.

There is not much on the tapes but I did tape Epsteinker on ABC's Good Morning America is you want that and on a Washington local TV show. I've given Dave Wrone the tapes. I'm sure he'll make copies if you want either.

I've filed suits for the Dallas and N.O. FO files. I think both. I know Dallas. I've also filed for the worksheets, etc. Hearing on that 3/6.

Only time will tell but I think the DOJ is beginning to see that its policy has led it to disasters of differing magnitudes and that as a result I may expect a little more compliance and perhaps a little less stonewalling and other antagonisms. This may or may not extend to the FBI.

I can't estimate the volume I'll be getting from the FBI on the new Epsteinker FOIA requests. Would you like copies, regardless of volume? Please let me know because I follow a uniform practise and Lil's time and mine are limited. When I receive a record I keep it as I receive it now. The originals are all put aside for the Univ. Wisc/Wrone archive. Lil makes copies and I work from them. Sometimes also a copy at the same time for JL. Mostly. It would be much better if you want copies for her to make them when she makes these others and from the originals. Otherwise it would be an ext a handling and would be from other than what for me are the originals.

You have had nothing to say about any AIB records. Can it be that they have gone dry? Or are they applying restirctions?

If you can get someone to do it if you do not have the time a check of Epsteinker's footnotes and appendix would be fruitful, I'm sure from what Dave has said. Hastily,